DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 071 IR 002 371

AUTHOR Cooke, Eileen D.
TITLE Legislative Report of the ALA Washington Office, January-June 1975.
INSTITUTION American Library Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the American Library Association Annual Conference (94th, San Francisco, California, June 29 through July 5, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; *Libraries; *Library Networks; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS 94th Congress; ALA 75; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV B; ESEA Title IV B

ABSTRACT

This report summarized briefly some of the federal legislation now pending or recently enacted that has implications for library service and for librarians. It covers the first six months of the first session of the 94th Congress, which convened January 14, 1975. The first section of the report discusses appropriations bills, without which funds would not be available to carry on federal programs such as the Library Services and Construction Act. The appropriations bills now being considered in Congress are those providing funds for fiscal year 1976. Some programs such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act's new Title IV-B Libraries and learning Resources, receive their funding a year in advance, so that their fiscal year 1977 appropriations are included in the education appropriations bill now before Congress. The second section of the report deals with legislative bills and related matters which Congress must pass to establish new programs or to extend existing ones. Attached to the end of the report are: 1) a table of funds giving details on the appropriation of funds for federal library and related programs and 2) a status-of-legislation chart summing up the status of a few bills with library-related implications. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110071

legislative report of the ALA washington office

January - June 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR 002 371

LEGISLATIVE REPORT OF THE ALA WASHINGTON OFFICE

94th CONGRESS, 1st SESSION

(January - June 1975)

This report summarizes briefly some of the federal legislation now pending or recently enacted which has implications for library service and for librarians. It covers the first six months of the first session of the 94th Congress which convened January 14, 1975.

The first section of the report discusses appropriations bills, without which funds would not be available to carry on federal programs such as the Library Services and Construction Act. The appropriations bills now being considered in Congress are those providing funds for fiscal year 1976, which begins on July 1, 1975. Fiscal year 1976, in effect, will be a 15-month year because the federal fiscal year is shifting from a July 1-June 30 cycle to an October 1-September 30 cycle beginning with FY 1977. That is, FY 1977 will begin on October 1, 1976.

Some programs such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act's new title IV-B Libraries and Learning Resources, receive their funding a year in advance, which means that FY 1977 appropriations for ESEA IV-B are included in the FY 1976 education appropriations bill now before Congress.

The second section of the report deals with legislative bills and related matters. These are the "authorization bills" that Congress must pass to establish new programs or extend existing ones that would otherwise expire. For example, the Higher Education Act, including its title II library programs, is scheduled to expire in FY 1976. Congress must therefore pass an authorization bill to extend it.

Attached at the end of the report are: (1) a table of funds giving details on the appropriation of funds for federal library and related programs and (2) a status-of-legislation chart summing up the status of a few bills with library-related implications.

American Library Association, Washington Office, June 26, 1975

INDEX

Appropriations.....Pg. 1
Arts & Humanities..... 4
Civil Rights..... 5
Community Development Grants..... 8
Congressional Budget Process..... 9
Copyright Commission.....10
Copyright Revision.....10
Criminal Code Revision.....12
ESEA Title IV-B.....12
Folklife Center in LC.....14
Handicapped.....15
Higher Education Act.....16
Intergovernmental Relations.....16
Japan-U.S. Friendship Act.....Pg.17
LSCA Regulations.....17
National Institute of Education.....18
Postal Rates.....18
Privacy.....19
Public Broadcasting.....20
Public Service Jobs.....20
Public Works.....21
Revenue Sharing.....22
Taxation.....23
WHCOLIS AND NCLIS 24
ATTACHMENTS: Funding Table
Status of Legislation Chart

Appropriations

1. Education and Library Programs

FY 1976 funding for the Library Services and Construction Act, and for the Higher Education Act Title II library programs is provided this year in a separate education appropriations bill (HR 5901) which passed the House by voice vote on April 16, was reported from the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 16 (S.Rept. 94-198) and is expected to come to the Senate floor for a vote either just before or after the congressional July 4 recess. Forward funding for FY 1977 is also included in this bill for the Adult Education Act and for a number of elementary and secondary education programs including School Libraries and Learning Resources (ESEA title IV-B). Attached to this report is a table providing more details on funding levels for library and related programs.

The intent of the House Appropriations Committee in splitting education appropriations off from the main Labor-HEW appropriations bill was at least in part to expedite their enactment into law so that schools would know well in advance of the academic year what federal funding would be available. But the education appropriations bill got bogged down in the congressional process, and the new fiscal year begins July 1 without FY 1976 library and education appropriations enacted into law.

An interim funding bill, the continuing resolution (HJ Res. 499) was cleared by Congress for the White House on June 20. It is awaiting President Ford's signature as this report goes to press on June 25. This year's continuing resolution provides that when an appropriations bill has passed both House and Senate as of July 1, 1975, but has not cleared conference, the programs shall be continued at whichever is less, the amount in the Senate bill or that in the House bill. If the bill has passed only one House as of July 1, the rate for operations shall not exceed the current rate or the rate permitted in the House bill, whichever is lower. Where the applicable bill has not been passed by either House as of July 1, the rate for operations for continuing projects shall not exceed the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower.

The Senate Appropriations Committee attempted to deal with the problem of impoundment under the continuing resolution by inserting language in the report (S. Rept. 94-201) accompanying HJ Res. 499 directing "that the rates of operation for programs and activities under the continuing resolution be interpreted as mandatory spending levels, just as would be the case in a regular appropriations bill. The Committee and the Congress will continue to entertain rescission and deferral messages, should the Administration have proposals to spend at rates of operation below the levels specified in the continuing resolution."

Wording in the House report accompanying HJ Res. 499 (H.Rept. 94-289) is just as explicit in the opposite direction: "It is essential that officials responsible for administering programs during the interim period covered by the resolution take only the limited action necessary for orderly continuation of projects and activities, preserving to the maximum extent possible the flexibility of Congress in arriving at final decisions. Accordingly, the rates of operation for programs and activities under the resolution are to be interpreted as ceilings and not as mandatory spending levels."

There is no conference report on the continuing resolution for the House agreed to accept the Senate version, although the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Rep. George Mahon (D-Tex.) stated his opinion that "the levels of continuing authority provided are ceilings. It is not mandatory. That has been the longstanding philosophy of such authority contained in continuing resolutions." Whether or not the Administration will attempt to impound library funds under the continuing resolution remains to be seen, but it would represent a radical departure from recent years' experience if no such impoundment is attempted.

A comparison of the library provisions of the House-passed bill, the bill as reported from the Senate Appropriations Committee (but not yet voted upon by the Senate) and FY 1975 funding levels follows:

Program	FY 1975	HR 5901 House	HR 5901 Senate
LSCA title I	$49,155,000	$49,155,000	$49,155,000
title II	-0-	-0-	-0-
title III	2,594,000	2,594,000	2,594,000
title IV	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total LSCA	51,749,000	51,749,000	51,749,000
ESEA title IV-B	1/	147,330,000	147,330,000
HEA title II-A	9,975,000	9,975,000	9,975,000
title II-B	3,000,000 2/	-0-	3,000,000
title VI	7,500,000	-0-	15,000,000
White House Conf. on Lib. & Inf. Services	-0-	-0-	3,500,000

1/ ESEA IV-B was not in existence in FY 1975. It was forward-funded in FY 1975 supplemental to begin in FY 1976. For FY 1976, $137,330,000 was appropriated with half for ESEA IV-B and half for the categorical programs it consolidates (ESEA II, part of ESEA III , and NDEA III).

2/ Of this amount, $2,000,000 for training, and $1,000,000 for research and demonstrations.

It is thanks to the efforts of three Representatives that the FY 1977 appropriation for ESEA IV-B was increased $10 million over its FY 1976 level. An amendment offered by Reps. Edward R. Roybal of California, David R. Obey of Wisconsin, and Louis Stokes of Ohio, during the April 16 floor debate on HR 5901 in the House, added a total of $487.5 million for 13 different education and library programs over the amount recommended by the House Appropriations Committee. Included in the Roybal-Obey-Stokes amendment in addition to the $10 million for ESEA IV-B was $5 million for title I of the Library Services and Construction Act. Without adoption of this amendment the House bill would have provided only $44,155,000 for title I, a cut of $5 million below FY 1975 levels. The vote on the Roybal-Obey-Stokes amendment was 259-143, with 30 members not voting.

And it is thanks to Senator Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), the Senate Majority Leader, that $3.5 million is included in the Senate Appropriations Committee bill for the White House Conference on Library and Information Services authorized by PL 93-568. No funds for the White House Conference are included in the House version of HR 5901.

2. Transitional Quarter Appropriations for Library Programs

The House-passed education appropriations bill (HR 5901) provides no funding for the transitional quarter (July - September 1976) for any of the library programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education, nor did the administration request library funding for this 3-month period. While transition quarter funding for some education programs is provided in HR 5901, it is not provided for many other programs, and it is possible that Congress may consider appropriating such funds later in a supplemental appropriations bill.

In addition to providing appropriations for the 3-month transition period, certain authorizations also must be extended, so that none of the numerous statutes on the books which authorize appropriations in one way or another fail for technical insufficiency or are inadvertently overlooked. To deal with this problem, the House Committee on Government Operations reported HR 6692 on June 11, a measure that will, among other things, continue for 3 months authorizations that expire on June 30, 1976. The bill was passed June 16, and is now pending in the Senate Government Operations committee. Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.), the ranking Republican member of the Government Operations Committee has introduced the companion bill in the Senate (S. 1874).

3. Library of Congress

The House of Representatives passed the FY 1976 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill (HR 6950) on May 21 by voice vote. The Library would receive $115,134,800 for FY 1976 according to the House-passed bill which the Senate has yet to act upon. This is $4,580,300 less than the Library requested, with the cuts coming primarily in the area of salaries and expenses.

LC had requested 140 new positions, of which only 46 were granted. The Congressional Research Service asked for 157 new positions, of which only 50 were allowed by the House. The Appropriations Committee in its report (H.Rept. 94-208) stated its concern over the accelerated growth in the staff of CRS, the Office of Technology Assessment, and the General Accounting Office, "which appears to far exceed what was contemplated when legislation establishing and expanding the responsibilities and duties of these agencies was under consideration." The Committee also noted that the new House Commission on Information and Facilities is charged with conducting a thorough and complete study of "House resources for information, including the Congressional Research Service, the General Accounting Office, and the Office of Technology Assessment, and the organizational framework that makes them effective or ineffective." The Committee anticipates that "the report of the Commission will be of great assistance in determining future needs of these agencies."

The House bill allows $15,813,000 for books for the blind and physically handicapped, $2,014,100 to maintain the special foreign currency program at this year's level, $3,136,000 for initial outfitting of the James Madison Memorial Library Building, and $9,653,391 for the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, to continue the program at the FY 1975 level. The bill also provides funding for the Library of Congress at the level of $28,769,000 for the transitional quarter (July - September 1976).

4. Government Printing Office

The House-passed legislative branch appropriations bill for FY 1976 (HR 6950) provides $36,765,700 for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents in FY 1976, and $108,500,000 for the Government Printing Office for printing and binding. The Appropriations Committee registered its concern over the increasing cost of congressional printing and binding, and inserted language in the bill restricting binding by congressional committees for distribution to individual committee members on a request basis only. In the past this binding has been done automatically for committee members. GPO would receive $36,316,400 for the transitional quarter under the House-passed bill. The Senate Appropriations Committee has yet to act upon HR 6950 as this report goes to press June 26.

Arts and Humanities

Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI), chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, introduced on May 21 the Arts, Humanities, and Cultural Affairs Act of 1975 (S.1800). Title I of this measure would extend through FY 1980 the authorizations for the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities (which would otherwise expire in FY 1976), with two substantive amendments to the basic authorizing legislation. The first amendment would provide a set-aside of 4 percent of authorized program funds for the support of the American Film Institute (AFI), and the second would mandate the creation of state humanities councils, which have until now been voluntary. Sen Pell noted that the two amendments are proposed for discussion purposes and it "could well be found in the hearings that no amendments are needed or that the idea established in these proposals can be achieved in another manner."

The AFI amendment is somewhat controversial. Legislation was proposed last year (but defeated in the House on December 16 by a vote of 123 yeas to 264 nays) to create an autonomous American Film Institute outside the National Endowment for the Arts. According to Sen. Pell, the idea of a percentage set-aside for the AFI "is a middle-ground route. It keeps the American Film Institute under the umbrella of the endowment, but allows the American Film Institute a certain amount of independence and latitude in setting its own course of action." But Sen. Javits of New York thinks it may set a bad precedent: "I believe it will tend to begin a process of fragmentation of the Endowment and could lead to lessening of the Endowment's overall impact of advocacy for the Arts."

Funds authorized for the two Endowments would not be increased by S.1800, but would be continued at FY 1976 levels ($113,500,000 for each) in FY 1977 and FY 1978, and "such sums as may be necessary" would be authorized for FY 1979 and 1980.

Title II of the bill authorizes a new Museum Services Act which would establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an Institute for the Improvement of Museum Services. The Institute would receive annual authorizations of $30 million through FY 1978 to make grants to museums to increase and improve museum services. Museum is defined as "a public or private nonprofit agency or institution organized on a permanent basis for essentially educational or esthetic purposes, which, utilizing a professional staff, owns and utilizes tangible objects, cares for them, and exhibits them to the public on a regular basis."

Title II would also establish an Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act, a federal program of indemnification to cover exhibitions which are brought to the United States as part of our country's international relations. As Sen. Pell described this provision: "It is not the purpose of the bill to reimburse museums for a chipped frame or glass, but I do believe there is a federal responsibility to reimburse, let us say, England, if works of art on loan from that country during the Bicentennial were damaged through accident or due to actions of a political extremist. There is precedent for such a program. The Federal Government has pledged its faith and credit to indemnify both the exhibition of the artifacts from the People's Republic of China and the current exhibition of Scythian gold at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City."

The same bill has been introduced in the House by Rep. John Brademas (D-Ind.), chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education which has jurisdiction over the Endowments. A hearing was held jointly by the Pell and Brademas subcommittees on June 4 to consider the proposed Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act. Hearings have not yet been held on the other parts of the bill, or on the administration's arts and humanities extension bill, which was introduced by Rep. Alphonzo Bell (R-Cal.)on May 22 (HR 7490) and by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-NY) and Sen. Pell the same day (S. 1809). The administration bill would extend authorizations for the Endowments through FY 1979, with annual authorizations at $113,500,000 for each endowment. It does not contain any of the museum-related provisions of the Pell-Brademas measure.

Civil Rights

1. HEW Civil Rights Enforcement — On June 4, 1975, HEW published in the Federal Register (pp. 24148-59) for public comment a proposed consolidated procedural regulation setting forth new procedures for implementing the Department's statutory civil rights responsibilities. As described by HEW Secretary Weinberger,

> "The essence of the proposal is to articulate the Department's role in civil rights enforcement in terms of a methodical approach geared toward identifying and eliminating systematic discrimination rather than in terms of a reactive or complaint-oriented approach geared toward securing individual relief for persons claiming discrimination.... complaints received by the Department over the last few years have not been broadly representative of the spectrum of the Department's civil rights enforcement program, since generally, in any given time period, more complaints involving sex discrimination in higher education academic employment have been received than on any other subject. Departmental enforcement policy must attempt to take into account this skew in complaints received and the factors which contribute to it so as to ensure that whole areas of non-compliance are not ignored merely because few, if any, complaints have been received. This problem is, perhaps, particularly acute in the area of national origin discrimination where potential complainants speak and write English with difficulty."

The proposed procedural regulation should be carefully reviewed by librarians and all concerned with equal employment opportunities, prohibition of sex discrimination, and affirmative action, for it is a controversial proposal in the eyes of many. Public comment is solicited from interested citizens until July 21, 1975, and should be sent to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, P.O. Box 24079, Washington, D.C. 20024.

Generally, the purpose of the new proposal is to establish a uniform procedure for enforcement of the various nondiscrimination requirements which are applicable to programs administered by the Department and for which responsibility has been delegated to the Director of HEW's Office for Civil Rights. The proposed enforcement procedures would apply to the Department's enforcement of:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in any federally assisted program or activity on the ground of race, color, or national origin;

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in federally assisted education programs and activities. (Title IX enacted in 1972 has yet to be implemented pending the development of regulations now scheduled to take effect July 21, 1975 unless disapproved by Congress.);

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in any federally assisted program or activity;

Section 799A of the Public Health Service Act, which concerns sex discrimination in admissions to medical and related health sciences schools.

Also administered by HEW's Office for Civil Rights and to be covered by the proposed procedural regulation are certain alcohol and drug abuse statutes, but not Executive Order 11246 as amended. The Department of Labor (not HEW) is responsible for the development of regulations implementing this Order, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin, religion or sex, by government contractors or by contractors performing under federally assisted construction contracts. EO 11246 is generally administered by the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance, but compliance responsibilities with respect to educational institutions, medical and health-related institutions, social service facilities, certain non-profit organizations, and state and local public agencies holding federal contracts and subcontracts have been delegated to HEW.

2. Title IX "Yesterday was the third anniversary of the congressional enactment of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 -- landmark legislation banning sex discrimination in all federally assisted education programs," Senator Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), a strong proponent of title IX, told his colleagues in the Senate on June 24. "After 3 years of study and evaluation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare released final regulations implementing this legislation on June 3, 1975."

Title IX (PL 92-318) provides that "no person in the United States shall on the basis of a sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." It forbids sex discrimination in any educational institution receiving federal assistance, including the nation's 16,000 public school systems and nearly 2,700 postsecondary institutions. Both admissions and employment are covered.

A year ago, on June 24, 1974, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published in the Federal Register (pp. 22227-40) a proposed regulation to implement title IX, with comments, suggestions, or objections solicited from the public. October 15, 1974 was set as the deadline for submission of comments on the draft

regulation. (In July 1974, the ALA Washington Office notified state library associations, state library agencies, state school media officers, members of ALA Council and Executive Board, and ALA divisions of the proposed regulation, the deadline for receipt of comments, and of regional briefings then being held on the subject by HEW).

Nearly 10,000 comments were received by HEW, and it was not until June 4, 1975 that the final regulations on title IX were published in the Federal Register (pp. 24128-45), nearly three years after it was enacted by Congress. The regulations which were approved by President Ford on May 27, will take effect July 21, 1975, unless Congress determines they are inconsistent with the title IX Act, in which case it can pass a concurrent resolution disapproving them. HEW would then be required to redraft the regulations. If such a concurrent resolution is not passed by July 21, the title IX regulations as published in the June 4 Federal Register become effective. (Congressional authority to review regulations promulgated by HEW was created in the Education Amendments of 1974 (PL 93-380), which amended Sec. 431 of the General Education Provisions Act to allow this procedure. Its constitutionality has been questioned by some.)

Because considerable controversy has been generated by the title IX regulations -- particularly over their coverage of college athletics -- the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education began hearings on the regulations in mid-June, and the Senate Subcommittee on Education has indicated that it will review the regulations also before the July 21 deadline.

Some Members of Congress believe HEW has exceeded its authority in drafting the title IX regulations, but others, like Senator Bayh, one of the sonsors of the title IX legislation in 1972, do not believe the regulations are contrary to the intent of Congress. Sen. Bayh testified before the O'Hara subcommittee to that effect: "As the prime sponsor of title IX, " Sen. Bayh said, "I feel the title IX regulations are consistent with both the spirit and intent of the Congress...." And he went on to say:

"While the regulations are disappointing in some respects, on balance the regulations do make significant strides in mandating equality for women. The heart of these guidelines is the prohibition or the thwarting of equal opportunity for female students and teachers at any educational level. The title IX guidelines, as the Congress mandated, call for equality in admissions, financial aid, course offerings, career counseling, and in the case of teachers and other educational personnel, employment, pay and promotions. We have waited three full years already for implementing regulations. Therefore I am urging the Congress to adopt the regulations without any further delay."

NB: The title IX regulations do not cover sex-stereotyping in textbooks and curricular materials. As HEW Secretary Weinberger said, "This produced a good deal of public comment. Nonetheless, the administration remains convinced that this position is correct, and the final regulation explicitly affirms this position... In my opinion, it would be both highly questionable from a constitutional standpoint, and wholly inappropriate for the federal government to move into this area and I do not think there is any evidence that the Congress desired such a result."

3. <u>EEO Requirements for Higher Education</u> To become effective July 1, 1975 are regulations promulgated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), under title VII of the Civil Rights Act, regarding reporting and recordkeeping requirements for public and private institutions of higher education. A reporting form called "Higher Education Staff Information Report EEO-6," instructions on how to fill it out and

the text of the new regulations were published in the June 12 Federal Register (pp. 25188-96). Title VII prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin in all employment practices, and covers private employers, employment agencies, unions, educational institutions, and state and local governments as well as the competitive federal civil service.

The new regulations require that on or before November 30, 1975, and biennially thereafter, every public and private institution of higher education having 15 or more employees shall file copies of the report with EEOC. The form is intended to meet most of the basic compliance reporting needs of various federal government agencies that have responsibility with respect to equal employment opportunity (including HEW's Office for Civil Rights), and EEOC hopes it will serve also as a valuable tool for use by the institutions in evaluating their own programs for insuring equal employment opportunity.

In general, the new reporting form requires institutions to report numbers of employees by sex and race/ethnic designation according to various categories such as executive and administrative, faculty, professional nonfaculty, or clerical and secretarial. An employer may acquire the race/ethnic information "either by visual surveys of the work force, or from post-employment records." EEOC notes that these methods are legal in all jurisdictions and under all federal and state laws. "State laws prohibiting inquiries and recordkeeping as to race, etc., relate only to applicants for jobs, not to employees."

4. House Hearings on Civil Rights Enforcement — The House Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities, chaired by Rep. Augustus Hawkins (D-Cal.) began a series of hearings on federal enforcement of title VII of the Civil Rights Act as well as Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 on June 19. Questions to be examined by the subcommittee during the course of the hearings will include the following: How effective have the executive orders and title VII been in eliminating employment discrimination? What kind of a job have the agencies charged with enforcement of these laws been doing? How much trained labor force is our nation losing because of lack of enforcement of these laws? Does the individual who has suffered discrimination or who may so suffer in the future receive protection and relief from the federal equal employment opportunity laws? Are affirmative action policies and programs being implemented to bring about full utilization of women and minorities?

John Dunlop, Secretary of Labor, testified the first day of the hearings, discussing EEO responsibilities of the Department of Labor which include EO 11246, the Equal Pay Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and others. Other executive departments will be testifying as well as the hearings continue.

Community Development Block Grants

Revised regulations governing the community development block grant program authorized by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (PL 93-383) were published in the June 9, 1975 Federal Register, beginning on p.24692. The regulations have been amended by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to state that neighborhood libraries are eligible for funding, and in the case of communities of under 10,000 population, central facilities are eligible.

This marks a reversal of HUD's earlier position that libraries were "ineligible activities" unless "part of a multipurpose neighborhood facilities project." The revised regulations stipulate that "single purpose" neighborhood facilities are eligible as are "multipurpose" neighborhood facilities.

The community development block grant program consolidates and replaces a number of former categorical programs like the neighborhood development, urban renewal, water-sewer, and open space programs administered by HUD. The primary objective of the block grant program is the "development of viable urban communities, including decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income." Funding decisions under the block grant program are made by local governing officials.

Congressional Budget Process

In fiscal year 1977, which begins October 1, 1976, the new congressional budget process established by the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (PL 93-344) becomes mandatory. But Congress has agreed to put certain provisions of the budget act into effect this year. The House and Senate Budget Committees (chaired respectively by Rep. Brock Adams, D-Wash.), and Sen. Edmund Muskie, (D-Me.)) reported to the House and Senate on March 3 (H.Rept. 94-25) and March 5 (S.Rept. 94-27) the following implementation plan which is now in effect for fiscal year 1976: (1) by April 15, 1975, both budget committees are to report first concurrent resolution on the budget, setting spending targets and estimated revenues for FY 1976; (2) by May 15 Congress is to adopt the first resolution; (3) by September 15, the budget committees report, and Congress is to complete action on second budget resolution; and (4) by September 25, Congress is to complete reconciliation process to the extent necessary.

Both House and Senate Budget Committees reported out the "first concurrent resolution" within the deadline: the House on April 14 (H.Con. Res. 218 and H.Rept. 94-145), and the Senate on April 15 (S.Con.Res. 32 and S.Rept. 94-77). Then on May 14, agreement was reached on spending and revenue "targets" (not ceilings) with the adoption by both House and Senate of the conference report (H.Rept.94-198) on the first concurrent resolution on the FY 1976 budget. H.Con.Res. 218 as amended was not presented to the President for signing because it is not a legislative proposal, but an expression of intent on the part of Congress to keep FY 1976 spending and revenues within certain limits.

The resolution sets the "appropriate level" of total budget outlays at $367 billion and the appropriate level of total new budget authority at $395.8 billion. It does not provide spending targets for individual programs, but only in aggregate. The conference report provides some additional details in terms of broad functional budget categories. For example, for the budget category of "education, manpower, and social services," which includes library programs with many others,budget authority is set at $19 billion and outlays at $19.85 billion. "These figures assume," the report states, "that all programs in this function can be funded at least at their fiscal year 1975 funding level, that regular on-going programs be increased, and that the number of public service employment jobs also be increased."

Come September Congress will attempt to reconcile its spending targets with its appropriations actions.

Copyright Commission

Although the Library of Congress requested $337,000 in FY 1976 funding to start up the National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works authorized by PL 93-573 enacted December 31, 1974, the House Appropriations Committee has deferred action on the requested appropriation "until such time as the members of the Commission have been appointed and a program has been developed." Twelve of the 13 Commission members are to be appointed by the President; the other member is to be the Librarian of Congress. The Senate Appropriations Committee may include funding for the Commission in its version of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill (HR 6950) if President Ford makes his appointments without additional delay.

The purpose of the Commission is to study and compile data on: "(1) the reproduction and use of copyrighted works of authorship (A) in conjunction with automatic systems capable of storing, processing, retrieving, and transferring information, and (B) by various forms of machine reproduction, not including reproduction by or at the request of instructors for use in face-to-face teaching activities; and (2) the creation of new works by the application or intervention of such automatic systems or machine reproduction." The Commission is directed to "make recommendations as to such changes in copyright law or procedures that may be necessary to assure for such purposes access to copyrighted works, and to provide recognition of the rights of copyright owners."

Copyright Revision

Hearings on general copyright revision began May 7 in the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice, chaired by Rep. Robert Kastenmeier (D-Wis.). Witnesses from the federal government led off, including John Lorenz, Acting Librarian of Congress; Barbara Ringer, Register of Copyrights; and representatives from the Departments of Justice, Commerce, and State.

Representatives of the library community were invited to appear before the subcommittee on May 14 to discuss library photocopying. With only 30 minutes allotted for the library presentation, six national library associations joined forces to present a unified statement to the subcommittee. Representing American Association of Law Librarians, American Library Association, Association of Research Libraries, Medical Library Association, Music Library Association, and Special Libraries Association, Edmon Low, chairman of ALA's copyright subcommittee, made the presentation, and a panel of witnesses was on hand to field questions from the subcommittee.

In addition to Mr. Low, the panel consisted of Julius J. Marke, chairman of AALL's copyright committee; John P. McDonald, ARL executive director; Joan Titley Adams, chairman of the Medical Library Association's copyright committee; Susan Sommer, chairman of the Music Library Association's copyright committee; Frank McKenna, executive director of SLA; James A. Sharaf, counsel for the Harvard University Library; William D. North, ALA counsel; and Philip B. Brown, ARL counsel. Although the subject of the hearing was limited to library photocopying, the librarians noted that other provisions of the bill are also of concern and may be the subject of further statements by the individual library associations.

Following the library presentation, the publishers and authors presented their statements: Townsend Hoopes and Charles Lieb representing the Association of American Publishers; Robert W. Cairns on behalf of the American Chemical Society; and Irwin Karp, counsel for the Authors League of America. The publishers and authors supported the library photocopying provisions of the bill while the librarians urged the deletion of three subsections (sec. 108 (g) (1), 108 (g) (2), and 108 (h). "Today's hearings are the first opportunity we have had to express publicly our very deep concern," the library associations told the subcommittee, with respect to these sections all of which were added by the Senate Judiciary Committee after the conclusion of copyright hearings in 1973.

Section 108 (g) (2) which prohibits "systematic reproduction" was treated in some detail in the library statement. "The question immediately arises," the library associations pointed out, "as to what constitutes systematic reproduction. To the extent that we are able to puzzle it out, it appears to have been aimed at practices of the kind which were upheld as fair use by the Court of Claims in the Williams & Wilkins case." This section must be stricken from the bill, the librarians told the subcommittee, in order that libraries may be permitted to continue "the long established library service of providing a single photocopy of a single article or excerpt from a copyrighted periodical or book for a patron's use without incurring liability for copyright royalties.

Additional copyright hearings on other issues have been scheduled throughout June, in July, and in September. Librarians are urged to send for the copyright revision bill (HR 2223) -- write your Representative for a copy or write to the House Document Room, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C. 20515 -- and to study not only section 107 (fair use) and 108 (reproduction by libraries and archives), but other provisions of the bill as well. In addition, if you would like a copy of the library associations' testimony on library photocopying, send a self-addressed envelope with 20¢ postage to the ALA Washington Office, 110 Maryland Ave. NE, Washington, D.C. 20002.

On the Senate side, the general copyright revision bill the Senate passed in September 1974 (S. 1361, 93rd Congress), was introduced as S. 22 during the second day of the 94th Congress (January 15, 1975) by the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights, Sen. John McClellan (D-Ark.). The Senate bill was marked up by the subcommittee on June 13 for full committee action, which will probably not occur until sometime after the congressional August recess.

Copyright - Williams & Wilkins — On February 25, 1975, the Supreme Court announced that it was equally divided in the case of Williams & Wilkins Co. v. the United States, with Justice Blackmun taking no part in the decision. With no indication of how the Justices voted and no indication of why Blackmun took no part, the complete text of the Court's one-line statement is: "The judgment is affirmed by an equally divided Court."

When the Supreme Court is so divided, the judgment of the lower court is affirmed, in this case the November 27, 1973 judgment of the U.S. Court of Claims, which ruled in a 4-3 decision that making single photocopies of journal articles by the National Library of Medicine and the National Institutes of Health staff library does not violate copyright laws. While the terms of this decision are narrow, the implications are significant from the standpoint of the protection of the public interest in the access to information.

Criminal Code Revision

The controversial Criminal Justice Reform Act of 1975 (S.1) was introduced on January 15, 1975 by Sen. John McClellan. It represents to some extent a revision of a bill by the same number introduced in the 93rd Congress. On May 1, ALA submitted testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, just as it did in the last Congress, calling attention to several provisions of S.1 which violate intellectual freedom. The statement was prepared by ALA's Office for Intellectual Freedom.

President Ford, in a June 19 message to Congress on the subject of crime (H.Doc. 94-191), urged Congress "to pass the kind of comprehensive code reform embodied in the Criminal Justice Reform Act." He did not endorse all the provisions of S.1, noting that "some of the proposals in this Act have stirred controversy and will undoubtedly precipitate further debate. For instance, concern has been expressed that certain provisions of the bill designed to protect classified information could adversely affect freedom of the press." This was one of ALA's grave concerns as was the section of S. 1 dealing with obscenity, concerning which ALA urged Congress "to reject all federal legislation -- if there is to be any -- that does not mandate such basic safeguards as prior civil proceedings, or that does not allow as an affirmative defense the fact that the dissemination occurred in a bona fide nonprofit library established for the educational, research, and recreational needs of its users."

The Senate Subcommittee has not yet scheduled markup of S.1. On the House side, some hearings on criminal code revision were held in the 93rd Congress, but there has been no action on the matter this year.

ESEA Title IV-B

Draft regulations to implement Libraries and Learning Resources, otherwise known as title IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, were published by the Office of Education in the March 12 Federal Register (pp. 11686-95), and should be read with care by all school library media specialists. Comments on the draft regulations were sought by the Office of Education (with a deadline of April 11), and following consideration of all comments received, USOE will publish the regulations again in the Federal Register, perhaps early in July.

ESEA title IV-B, established by the Education Amendments of 1974 (PL 93-380) consolidates into one program three individual categorical programs: ESEA title II (school library resources), part of ESEA III (guidance, testing and counseling), and NDEA III (educational equipment and minor remodeling).

It is important that as many school librarians as possible see the regulations and become familiar with the provisions of the new ESEA title IV-B program. The Federal Register, published 5 days a week (except holidays) by the federal government, is generally available in medium and large public libraries, in college or university libraries, and in depository libraries. It is also available for sale (individual issues 75¢) from the Government Printing Office or its bookstores.

Libraries and Learning Resources is a state-based program, with local education agencies having complete discretion as to how they spend their share of the ESEA IV-B funds. The funds can be spent not only for school library resources, but also for educational equipment or minor remodeling, guidance, testing, or counseling. The program is brand-new and it is unclear to what extent school library service nationwide will benefit.

Competition for the funds at the local level will play a key role in the new program. *School library/media specialists must, therefore, be familiar with* how ESEA title IV-B works -- and it may work slightly differently in different states. This, therefore, is what should be done now: (1) read the draft regulations cited above, and (2) find out how your own state is organizing at the state level to administer the new program. Each state is required to have an advisory council to evaluate the effectiveness of ESEA IV-B and to plan for its administration throughout the state. Who are the members of your state's ESEA IV-B advisory council? Is one of the members knowledgeable about school library media service? Take the time now to learn how your state is organizing for ESEA title IV-B.

The more you know about the program, the more chance there is that school library service in your community will benefit from this new form of educational assistance from the federal government. ALA opposed enactment of this new consolidated form of library and related educational assistance, preferring instead the school library program authorized since 1965 by title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. However, there was considerable pressure from the administration and from chief state school officers, school administrators and others to try the consolidation approach and Congress voted to do it.

It should be emphasized, however, that Members of Congress are interested in the new ESEA title IV program, and they will be watching the effects of consolidation. Their hope is that the new Libraries and Learning Resources program will simplify paperwork and eliminate red tape at the state and local level. In congressional testimony, however, ALA and other groups have pointed out the dangers inherent in consolidation. For example, there is likely to be increased political infighting at the state and local level as guidance counselors may be put in the position of fighting for their own salaries while librarians are fighting for resource funds and both must come out of the same pot. There is also the danger that when no funds are specifically earmarked for libraries at the national level, then perhaps no funds will be spent for that purpose at the local level.

However, the program has been enacted, $137,330,000 has been appropriated by Congress to phase it in during FY 1976, with half the appropriation to go for the individual categorical programs and the other half for the consolidation. And $147,330,000 is provided for FY 1977 in the 1976 education appropriations bill (HR 5901) although this measure has not yet been enacted (see section on APPROPRIATIONS for details on HR 5901). The following table shows how the program will be phased in in FY 1976:

Program	FY 1976	FY 1977
ESEA II (library resources)	45,125,000	-0-
ESEA III (guidance, testing)	9,415,000	-0-
NDEA III (educ. equipment)	14,125,000	-0-
ESEA IV-B (consolidation)	68,665,000	147,330,000**
Total	$137,330,000	$147,330,000

**Amount provided in House-passed education appropriations bill (HR 5901) and recommended in Senate Appropriations Committee bill reported from committee June 18. The budget request for ESEA IV-B was $137,330,000 for both FY 1976 and FY 1977.

Congress will be watching how the new ESEA IV-B program works. Rep. Carl Perkins chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, has stated that he is prepared at a later date to hold oversight hearings on libraries and learning resources if necessary. But before such hearings can be held, the school library/media community must become familiar with the new law and keep some statistics on how it is working in comparison with the old ESEA title II program. We must be able to document the case as to whether or not the new consolidated program is helping or hurting the development of school library media service.

Meanwhile, the constitutionality of ESEA title IV-B has been called into question by a Supreme Court ruling which declared a similar program at the state level unconstitutional. A Pennsylvania state law providing loans of instructional materials and equipment to private schools has been ruled unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court, which at the same time upheld the state's textbook loan program for children in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. Also struck down by the May 19 decision in which the court split 6-3 was Pennsylvania's law providing "auxiliary services" to children in private schools.

Instructional materials are defined as including "books, periodicals, photographs, maps, charts, recordings, and films." Instructional equipment includes "projectors, recorders, and laboratory paraphernalia," and the so-called auxiliary services include "counseling, testing, psychological services, and speech and hearing therapy and related services for exceptional, remedial, or educationally disadvantaged students." Textbooks are defined as "books, reusable workbooks, or manuals, whether bound or in looseleaf form, intended for use as a principal source of study material for a given class or group of students, a copy of which is expected to be available for the individuals use of each pupil in such class or group."

The ruling came in a suit brought by three individuals (all resident taxpayers in Pennsylvania) and four organizations -- the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Pennsylvania Jewish Community Relations Council, and the Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

The court's decision in the Pennsylvania case (Meek et al. v. Pittenger, Secretary of Education, et al., No. 73-1765) has serious implications for the new federal aid program authorized by ESE title IV-B, Libraries and Learning Resources, which provides grants to the states for library resources, educational equipment, guidance, counseling, and testing services. ESEA IV-B requires the "equitable participation" of children in private elementary and secondary schools. It is generally expected that once ESEA IV-B funds have been distributed to the local education agencies, a suit will be brought challenging the constitutionality of the program. The same may occur with respect to title I of ESEA, which authorizes a wide range of services for educationally disadvantaged students.

Folklife Center in the Library of Congress

The Committee on House Administration, believing that a "serious federal effort should be made to make possible the preservation of the folk and ethnic cultures of Americans," reported out a bill (HR 6673) on June 10 that would establish an American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress. The Center would be authorized to enter into contracts, make grants and loans, and award scholarships to individuals and groups for research, scholarship, training, exhibits, performances, and workshops, and it would be directed to establish and maintain in conjunction with other federal agencies a national archive

and center for American folklife. The bill would authorize $167,750 for the Center in FY 1976, $710,000 for FY 1977, and $1,716,000 for FY 1978. These amounts include the grant-making authority and were recommended by the Librarian of Congress as the minimum funding levels necessary to establish and operate the Center.

American folklife is broadly defined in the bill to mean "the traditional customs, beliefs, dances, songs, tales, sayings, art, crafts, and other expressions of the spirit common to a group of people within any area of the United States, and includes music (vocal and instrumental), dance, drama, lore, beliefs, language, humor, handicraft, painting, sculpture, architecture, other forms of creative and artistic expression, and skills related to the preservation, presentation, performance, and exhibition of the cultural heritage of any family, ethnic, religious, occupational, racial, regional, or other grouping of American people."

ALA supported this legislation last year in testimony submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on the Library as well as to the Committee on House Administration. There is widespread bipartisan support for the measure in Congress, but it is opposed by the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities. In its report (H.Rept. 94-273), the House Administration Committee takes note of the fact that the National Endowments' enabling legislation permits them to undertake activities in the folklife area, but goes on to say that the Endowments "have shown little inclination to make a genuine commitment in this area, apparently preferring instead to focus on 'high culture.'"

A similar measure (S.1618) introduced by Sen. James Abourezk (D-SD), with strong bipartisan cosponsorship, is pending in the Senate Subcommittee on the Library. This is a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Handicapped

The Bill of Rights for the Mentally Retarded, included last year as title II of a Senate-passed bill amending the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act (DDSFCA) but still awaiting House-Senate conference when the 93rd Congress adjourned in December, was reintroduced in the 94th Congress as title II of S. 462 by Sen. Jennings Randolph (D-W VA.). The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported the DDSFCA bill on May 22 (S. Rept. 94-160) and the Senate passed it on June 2. The comparable House-passed measure (HR 4005) extends and amends the Developmental Disabilities Act but does not include the Bill of Rights for the Mentally Retarded. The decision about whether to retain the Bill of Rights will be settled in a House-Senate conference.

First introduced in 1972 by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.), the Bill of Rights includes the standards for residential and community facilities of the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals (JCAH), which outline in considerable detail the various types of professional services -- including library services -- that should be available to residents and staff of such facilities. Developed a number of years ago by representatives of the Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries and other librarians working with JCAH, the section on standards for library service begins as follows: "Library services, which include the location, acquisition, organization, utilization, retrieval, and delivery of materials in a variety of media, shall be available in the residential facility, in order to support and strengthen its total habilitation program by providing complete and integrated multimedia information services to both staff and residents."

Higher Education Act

Hearings have begun in both the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and the Senate Education Subcommittee on extension of the Higher Education Act which will expire in FY 1976. Although it is authorized only through FY 1975, HEA is automatically extended one year while Congress considers its renewal. The automatic one-year extension is provided by Sec. 414 of the General Education Provisions Act as amended.

In the House subcommittee chaired by Rep. James O'Hara (D. Mich.), the first series of hearings (now concluded) centered on student financial assistance. On February 20, Mr. O'Hara introduced HR 3471 which would amend and extend the basic statutory authority for general federal student financial assistance. Among other things, HR 3471 would require full funding of the college work study program (for which graduate students are eligible as well as undergraduates) at $480 million the first year and at a higher amount in succeeding years before the undergraduate basic opportunity grants (BOG) could be funded. The bill would also remove financial need as a prerequisite to participation in the work study program. Mr. O'Hara proposed reducing considerably the loan component in the federal student assistance program, increasing instead grant and work opportunities. His bill would award supplemental educational opportunity grants on the dual basis of need and merit, with the idea that "students who have demonstrable need, but who also have demonstrable academic promise, whould be able to receive more than just the basic grant which the BOG program gives to everyone who can show financial need."

After concluding the hearings on student aid, the subcommittee had originally planned to move on with the rest of the Higher Education Act, including its title II library provisions, but it has been temporarily delayed by consideration instead of the title IX sex-discrimination regulations on which hearings began in mid-June. (See section on CIVIL RIGHTS for information on title IX.) Mr. O'Hara has introduced a bill (HR 3470) which would provide a simple extension of HEA programs through FY 1980, which he has called "a starting point" for consideration of the rest of the Act.

No bill has been introduced on the Senate side to extend the Higher Education Act, although hearings opened June 10 in the education subcommittee chaired by Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI) on HEA title IV, student assistance. "These hearings are in the nature of oversight and information," Sen. Pell announced. "It is my view that the upcoming higher education legislation will hopefully be a simple extension of the existing legislation. The new and varied programs of student assistance enacted in the 1972 bill are now settling into operation. I believe that they should be given a few more years to grow. With more experience gained from their operation meaningful amendments could be considered. What we do intend in this year's higher education bill is to adjust the existing law and regulations so that the goals of the 1972 legislation can be more easily obtained. After the July 4 congressional recess, Sen. Pell's subcommittee will continue its hearings on the rest of the Higher Education Act including the library programs.

Intergovernmental Relations

The Senate Government Operations Committee's Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Edmund Muskie (D-Me.), has considered an intergovernmental approach to unemployment and recession, a so-called Intergovernmental Counter-Cyclical Assistance Act (S. 1359) which was introduced by Sen. Muskie on April 7. This measure would provide emergency anti-recession assistance to state and local governments to make sure their budget actions are coordinated with the federal government's efforts to restore growth and prosperity to the

economy. It would provide assistance so that the states, for example, would not be required to cut back their ongoing operations just when the federal government is trying to stimulate the economy through tax cuts and expenditure increases. The bill has been marked up in the subcommittee but no action has occurred in the full committee. Further action is likely later in the summer.

On the House side, Rep. L.H. Fountain (D-NC), chairman of the Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources, plans to hold hearings in July to develop background information on "Fiscal Relations and the American Federal System." General revenue sharing and counter-cyclical assistance will be considered in the course of these hearings. See also section on REVENUE SHARING.

Japan-US Friendship Act

On June 13, the Senate passed by voice vote and sent to the House Committee on International Affairs a bill (S.824) that would provide for the use of certain funds to promote scholarly, cultural, and artistic activities between Japan and the United States. The measure, introduced February 25 by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-NY) with strong bipartisan cosponsorship, would create a trust fund with some of the proceeds from the Okinawa Reversion Agreement of 1971 and funds available in U.S. accounts in Japan which would be used for such purposes as support for major collections of Japanese books and libraries at U.S. colleges and universities located throughout the U.S. and support for studies including language studies in institutions of higher education or scholarly research in Japan and the U.S. designed to foster mutual understanding between the two countries. The Senate also passed this bill in the 93rd Congress, but no action occurred on the House side.

LSCA Regulations

In compliance with the Education Amendments of 1974 (PL 93-380) which added the requirement that a priority in funding under the Library Services and Construction Act must be given to areas with a high concentration of persons with limited English-speaking ability, the U.S. Office of Education issued proposed changes to the LSCA regulations in the March 20 Federal Register (p. 12671). Following a period for public comment, the regulation was published in final form in the June 12, 1975 Federal Register on p. 25013, along with a list of suggested sources the states might use to identify those individuals who were not born in the United States or whose native language is other than English, as well as individuals who come from an environment where a language other than English is dominant. The sources listed are: (1) census data on specific states in the 1970 Census of Population; (2) maps from the Geography Division, Bureau of the Census, 1970 - with states and counties color-coded to show minorities and ethnic groups by county; (3) bilingual data from state and local educational statistics; (4) bilingual data from state and local service agencies; and (5) the "Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts, Enrollment and Staff by Racial/Ethnic Groups," Fall 1972, DHEW Office of Civil Rights, OCR 74-5.

National Institute of Education

HR 5988, the administration's bill to extend the authorization for the National Institute of Education, was introduced on April 15 by Rep. John Brademas and 23 bipartisan co-sponsors at the request of the administration. S. 1498, the identical measure, was introduced in the Senate by Sen. J. Glenn Beall (R-Md.). Among priorities that would be established by the bill is improved dissemination to help make more effective the application of the results of educational research and development. The Education and Labor Committee, to which this bill was referred, plans to undertake a study of NIE in connection with its consideration of legislation to extend it. NIE was established by the Education Admendments of 1972 (PL 92-318) and was authorized to spend up to $550 million over three years. Congressional appropriations have been far beneath the authorized ceiling. For example, in FY 1975 Congress voted to appropriate only $70 million for NIE although the administration had requested $134,500,000 for NIE that year.

Postal Rates

On July 6, 1975, the cost of postage goes up again, not for first class, but for both the library rate and the special fourth-class book rate. The Library rate, now 6¢ for the first pound and 3¢ for each additional pound, will become 7¢ for the first and 3¢ for succeeding pounds. The fourth-class book rate, now 18¢ for the first and 8¢ for additional, becomes 19¢ for the first pound and 9¢ for succeeding pounds.

Meanwhile, the Postal Rate Commission is deep into the proceedings of its second rate case which began in September 1973 when the U.S. Postal Service submitted requests for rate increases affecting all classes of mail. When finally concluded, perhaps later this summer or fall, postal rates will be in for even greater increases. The proceeding took a drastic turn on May 28, when the Commission's chief administrative law judge announced a recommended increase that would raise the book rate over a period of years to 40¢ for the first pound and 20¢ for each additional pound, which amounts to a 120 percent increase over the present first pound rate and 150 percent increase over the present additional pound rate. The judge recommended that the library rate be increased over a period of years to 29¢ for the first and 14¢ for each additional pound, which amounts to a 383 percent increase for the first pound rate and 363 percent for the additional pound rate, over the present first and succeeding pound rates.

The judge's recommendations are not final, and already ALA, the Association of American Publishers and others have filed statements with the Postal Rate Commission in strong opposition to the judge's initial decision. Among other things, if his decision were allowed to stand, it would cost a library 60¢ for postage alone to receive a 1½ pound book by mail from a publisher, and it would cost 43¢ for one library to send a 1½ pound book to another library or to a patron.

The next step is for the Postal Rate Commission to make its own recommendations on rate increases. In the first proceeding, the Commission turned down some of its law judge's recommended increases, but it recommended higher rates in other instances than had the judge. Once the Postal Rate Commission makes it recommendations in this proceeding, the matter will come before the Governors of the Postal Service. All of this will take a number of weeks or months. But one thing is clear: higher postal rates are in the offing.

Librarians in all types of libraries are urged to start keeping records of how much money is being spent for each class of postage. While this is bound to be time-consuming and laborious, it is extremely important that we begin to document specifically how continually rising postal costs are affecting library service in all parts of the country. Your help is urgently sought in keeping these records.

The House Postal Service Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. James Hanley (D-NY), began markup in mid-June of HR 2445, a bill sponsored by chairman Hanley that would, among other things, create a federal subsidy to the Postal Service in recognition of its public service functions. ALA testified in support of this bill a year ago and recommended additional amendments to strengthen it. Further subcommittee markup sessions are scheduled for early July. At this time, a bill sponsored by Rep. William Ford (D-Mich.), to clarify existing law with respect to second class mailing of college bulletins and catalogs and looseleaf publications, may also be considered by the Subcommittee.

Upon introduction of his bill June 19 (HR 7735), Mr. Ford who is a member of the Hanley Subcommittee noted that such publications have been routinely accepted as second class for many years. "In a reversal of long-accepted policy, however, the Postal Service has begun administrative proceedings, to revoke these privileges because college bulletins and catalogs and looseleaf publications, it claims, are not 'newspapers and other periodical publications' covered by second class." Sen. Thomas Eagleton (D-Mo.) introduced on June 25 a companion bill assuring continued second class mailing of college catalogues. His measure (S. 2015) has the bipartisan support of 29 cosponsors.

Privacy

The Privacy Act of 1974 (PL 93-579) requires federal agencies to publish in the Federal Register rules to implement the overall purposes of the act -- which is designed to permit an individual to determine what records pertaining to him are collected by federal agencies and to permit him to prevent such records from being used or made available for another purpose without his consent -- and (2) various notices describing the systems of records they keep.

On June 19, the Office of the Federal Register issued a document entitled "Publication Guidelines for the Privacy Act of 1974," to assist federal agencies in complying with the publication requirements of the Act. See June 19, 1975 Federal Register (pp. 25988-26013) for details. The Privacy Act takes effect for the first time on September 27, 1975.

The 7-member Privacy Protection Study Commission, also authorized by the 1974 Privacy Act, was finally constituted on June 10 when President Ford announced his 3 appointments to the Commission. The other 4 members had already been appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. Among other things, this Commission, which scheduled its first meeting for June 23, is to make a study of data-banks, automated data processing programs, and information systems of governmental, regional and private organizations in order to determine the standards and procedures in force for the protection of personal privacy while meeting the legitimate needs of government and society for information.

Public Broadcasting

Similar bills that would both authorize and appropriate funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting are now pending before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees (HR 6461 and S. 893), having been favorably reported respectively from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The measures would provide authorization-appropriation ceilings starting at $88 million for FY 1976 and increasing annually to $160 million for FY 1980, with the amount appropriated in any given year tied to the amount of non-federal financial support received by the Corporation, stations, and other public broadcasting entities from state and local governmental and private sources. The federal appropriation would increase only as nationwide non-federal support grows for public broadcasting. The Corporation would be required to distribute from 40 to 50 percent of its annual appropriation directly to on-the-air noncommercial educational broadcasting stations (radio and television) for their programming, operation, and maintenance.

Both House and Senate bills would also authorize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to engage in the development and use of non-broadcast communications technologies such as cable television and communications satellites for the distribution and dissemination of educational radio and television programs.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in its report on HR 6461 (H.Rept. 94-245 part 1), "recommends that the CPB carefully evaluate the report on Public Broadcasting and Education which has been submitted to it by the Advisory Council of National Organizations and seriously consider implementing appropriate recommendations, especially in the areas of early childhood and adult education." Librarians, too, will be interested in this 114-page book which was published in March 1975 and is available for $1.50 from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, 1111 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. The American Library Association is a member of the CPB's Advisory Council of National Organizations, and served as a consultant to the adult education task force that helped to develop this report.

Public Service Employment (CETA VI), and Unemployment Assistance

Congress is now working to extend through FY 1976 the Emergency Jobs Program authorized by title VI of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA VI). This program was enacted December 31, 1974 (PL 93-567) to combat growing national unemployment by creating transitional public service employment. It was an emergency one-year measure with $2.5 billion authorized for the program in FY 1975.

With the Act due to expire June 30, 1975 (although there is money in the pipeline to continue the jobs program for the time being), the House Subcommittee on Manpower, Compensation, and Health and Safety, after 9 days of hearings, marked up on June 19 HR 2584 which is now awaiting further action in the full Education and Labor Committee. As approved by the subcommittee, the bill would extend CETA title VI through FY 1976 and authorize $5 billion for the program.

Several substantive changes to the present program are recommended by the subcommittee. Among other things, private nonprofit organizations offering public services, local school boards, and other units of local government would be eligible employers of title VI employees, and potential employers would be required to compete for the manpower funds. This process was designed by the subcommittee to cut down on the political patronage that has accompanied the CETA VI programs in some areas. The subcommittee bill would require each prime sponsor to establish an advisory committee to evaluate applications submitted by a wide range of potential employers. The measure would also increase the present $10,000 salary limitation to $12,000 for up to one-third of the CETA VI employees in any given prime sponsor area. The existing salary limitation would apply to the remaining two-thirds.

On the Senate side, a number of bills have been introduced to extend CETA title VI, (S. 1695, S. 609, S. 767), and hearings have been concluded in the Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor chaired by Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.). Subcommittee mark-up of the legislation is expected during the month of July.

Both House and Senate have passed legislation (HR 6900) amending and extending two programs enacted by Congress last December to deal with the unemployment crisis: (1) the supplemental benefits program to aid the long-term unemployed who had exhausted their entitlements under the regular unemployment compensation program; and (2) the Special Unemployment Assistance program (SUA) (PL 93-567), which provides unemployment assistance benefits for workers who are not protected by any existing federal or state unemployment compensation. Conferees are expected to resolve differences between the two versions of HR 6900 either just before or after the July 4 recess.

Public Works

On May 20, the House passed by a vote of 313-86 the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1975 (HR 5247), which would authorize $5 billion for local public works projects. Priority would be given to projects that can be started without delay in areas of high unemployment. Libraries are specifically cited in the committee report accompanying the bill (H.Rept. 94-203) as projects that would be eligible for funding under the measure. ALA in testimony submitted to the House Public Works and Transportation Committee supporting the bill had requested "that the Committee report explicitly state the eligibility of public libraries. This is essential because of a tendency on the part of the federal bureaucracy to narrowly define such terms as 'public facilities' to exclude public libraries. For example, much time and effort were recently required on the part of communities throughout the country as well as Members of Congress," ALA told the committee," to correct community development block grant regulations which ha erroneously excluded public libraries."

The Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Economic Development, chaired by Sen. Joseph Montoya (D-NM) held hearings on the House-passed bill in May along with S. 1587, a bill sponsored by Sen. Montoya that would provide increased authorizations for the Public Works and Economic Development Act and add new authorizations to PWEDA to increase the federal share for federally-assisted projects which can have immediate impact on economic activity. Subcommittee markup of S. 1587 was completed June 19 and the measure is now pending in the full Public Works Committee where further action is not expected until after the July 4 congressional recess. (See section on INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS for another approach to unemployment and recession being developed in the Government Operations Committee.

Revenue Sharing

On April 28, President Ford transmitted to Congress the proposed State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act Amendments of 1975 (H.Doc. 94-117), his recommendations for amendments to and extension of the general revenue sharing program which expires on December 31, 1976. "I strongly recommend," the President said, "that the Congress act to continue this highly successful and important new element of American Federalism well in advance of the expiration date, in order that State and local governments can make sound fiscal plans." President Ford went on to say that the general revenue sharing "program has been a resounding success." Since its enactment, he noted, general revenue sharing has provided nearly $19 billion to 50 states and some 39,000 local governments -- "money which these governments could use as they saw fit to meet their priority needs."

The administration bill was then introduced in the House (HR 6558) by Rep.L.H. Fountain (D-NC), chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources which has jurisdiction over general revenue sharing; and in the Senate (S. 1625) by Senator William Hathaway (D-Me.), chairman of the Senate Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Revenue Sharing. In general, it would continue revenue sharing as it now exists, authorizing the program through September 30, 1982, and continuing the $150 million annual increase provided in the existing law. From January 1, 1977 through September 30, 1982, the Ford proposal would authorize $39.85 billion in general revenue sharing. This compares with $30.2 billion authorized for the first 5 years of the program.

Sen. Hathaway's subcommittee held hearings on operating experiences under the general revenue sharing program in mid-May, and plans to hold additional hearings later. Upon introduction of the administration bill, Sen. Hathaway noted his opinion that "it is too early to draw a final conclusion about the advisability of renewing this program, or about what form that renewal should take. Although in the eyes of most local officials the program appears to be a success, the hearings we have already held before the Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Revenue Sharing have shown that many of those outside of local government circles were somewhat less than effusive in their praise of revenue sharing. I feel we need more hearings from a somewhat broader spectrum of witnesses before we can decide what should be done with this program."

Rep. Fountain's subcommittee has scheduled general background hearings for July to consider the topic of fiscal relations and the American federal system. Both general revenue sharing and counter-cyclical assistance will be considered in the course of these hearings which will not be focused on specific bills but upon broad issues. (See section on INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS for more information on counter-cyclical assistance.)

The Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee for Fiscal Policy, chaired by Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.) has also pursued the subject of revenue sharing. Hearings were held on June 24 and 25 to focus on evaluations of the present distribution formula of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act and on suggested alternatives. In announcing these hearings Rep. Bolling stated: "While there are many important issues related to the general revenue sharing program, none will receive or warrant as much consideration as the distribution formula. The question of which jurisdictions should be eligible, what criteria

should be used in allocating the funds and what incentives should be incorporated in the formula are central to the efficacy of the program."

In summary, while there is congressional action and considerable talk on revenue sharing, neither House nor Senate has taken systematic action to amend and extend the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act.

The U.S. Office of Revenue Sharing recently published two pamphlets which provide some information on libraries and general revenue sharing. The first, dated February 1975 is entitled General Revenue Sharing: Reported Uses 1973-1974: A Tabulation and Analysis of Data from Actual Use Report 4. Among other things this 48-page booklet shows that some 34,000 units of state and local government have reported spending about $82 million of their general revenue sharing dollars for public libraries in fiscal year 1974. Some $36 million or 44 percent of the total went for capital expenditures, with the remaining $56 million or 56 percent for operating and maintenance expenses. The library dollars represent about 1 percent of all revenue sharing received by state and local governments during this period.

The other report, dated March 1, 1975, is entitled Second Annual Report of the Office of Revenue Sharing. This 50-page booklet presents a table showing use of revenue sharing funds reported by states and local governments from January 1, 1972 when the general revenue sharing program began, through June 30, 1974. In this two-and-half-year period, the governmental units reported spending $101 million of their general revenue sharing for libraries with $6 million of this spent by the states, and $95 million by local governments. Public safety, education, transportation, and environmental protection, health, and general governmental multi-purpose expenses received the bulk of revenue sharing dollars. Libraries fall at the bottom, with only about 1 percent of general revenue sharing.

Both reports are available from the Government Printing Office.

Taxation

A number of bills have been introduced in Congress this year dealing with tax deductions for charitable contributions to institutions such as libraries and museums. S. 1435 introduced by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-NY) on April 15, and HR 6057, an identical bill introduced April 16 by Rep. John Brademas (D-Ind.), would allow artists and authors to deduct 75 percent of the market value of their works donated to charitable institutions. The deduction would apply only to their art-related income. Explaining the rationale of his bill Sen. Javits said: "I believe that the value of important contributions of major works of art to our museums, libraries, universities, and other cultural institutions will far outweigh the modest revenue lost -- estimated at under $10 million per year -- to the Federal Government." The Javits-Brademas bills were referred to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. Neither Sen. Javits nor Rep. Brademas are members of these committees. Both introduced the same legislation in the last Congress, but no action was taken by the committees.

Other bills that would allow tax deductions for the donation of literary, musical or artistic works to cultural institutions such as libraries have been introduced by Rep. Edward Koch (D-NY) -- for example, HR 585, HR 6829 -- and these, too, have been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. However, Mr. Koch is not a member of the committee.

Meanwhile, hearings on tax reform began June 23 in the House Ways and Means Committee chaired by Rep. Al Ullman (D-Ore.), but the subject of charitable contribution deductions will not be considered in the first phase of these hearings scheduled to conclude by the end of July, with committee markup of a tax reform bill early in September. The hearings began with a general discussion of approaches to tax reform and to simplification and restructuring of the tax laws, presumably designed to assist the many new members of the Ways and Means Committee in familiarizing themselves with the complicated subject matter. Administration witnesses are scheduled to testify July 8 and 9, and members of the interested public later in July. Tax shelters and minimum tax, tax simplification, capital gains and losses, and extension of the individual tax reductions provided by the Tax Reduction Act of 1975 (PL 94-12), are among subjects to be covered in the first round of hearings.

The second phase of the hearings, scheduled now to begin in November after the committee has developed a bill from the first hearings, will cover a wide range of other subjects including tax-exempt organizations and private foundations, charitable contribution deductions, tax-exempt state and municipal bonds, and tax treatment of annuities. Details of the subjects to be covered in each of the hearings are provided in a committee print available from the House Ways and Means Committee entitled: "Press Release Announcing Panel Discussions, Testimony from the Administration, and Testimony from the Interested Public ... on Tax Reform Beginning on June 23, 1975."

In 1973 during Ways and Means Committee hearings on tax reform, ALA submitted testimony to the committee calling attention to the marked decline in manuscript donations that libraries have received since enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 and urging restoration of the tax deduction based on fair market value which had previously been granted to authors who donated their manuscripts to qualified libraries and other nonprofit institutions. But pension reform and trade legislation took first priority with the Ways and Means Committee at that time and little tax reform work was accomplished in the 93rd Congress.

White House Conference on Library & Information Services

PL 93-568 specifies that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will plan and conduct the White House Conference, and a 28-member advisory committee is to be appointed to assist the Commission. The advisory committee is to be composed of:

--five persons appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate
--five persons appointed by the Speaker of the House
--at least three members of the National Commission, appointed by the chairman
--no more than 15 persons appointed by the President of the United States

The following persons have been appointed to serve on the Advisory Committee:

The Honorable Jacob Javits, U.S. Senator from New York
J.C. Redd, businessman from Jackson, Mississippi
John T. Short, president-elect, American Library Trustee Association of Avon, Connecticut
Margaret Warden, state senator and library trustee, Great Falls, Montana?
Virginia Young, Chairman, Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education, Columbia, Missouri
-- all appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate

The Honorable William D. Ford, U.S. Representative from Michigan
Allie Beth Martin, director of Tulsa City-County Library, Tulsa, Oklahoma, president-elect, American Library Association
Michael Arthur McCarroll, director of Lexington Books, a division of D.C. Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts
Gene Shalit, of New York City, panelist on NBC's Today Show
Jean Hurley Simon, former member of Illinois Assembly, wife of U.S. Representative Paul Simon, of Carbondale, Illinois
-- all appointed by the Speaker of the House

Louis A. Lerner, publisher, Lerner Home Newspapers, Chicago, Illinois
Bessie Boehm Moore, coordinator, Economic and Environmental Education, State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas
John E. Velde, Jr., businessman, Pekin, Illinois and Hollywood, California
-- all members of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, appointed to the White House Conference Advisory Committee by the NCLIS chairman

The President of the United States has not yet made his appointments to the Advisory Council. See section on APPROPRIATIONS for WHCOLIS funding.

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

Just as this report was going to press, the House of Representatives debated and passed on June 25 the FY 1976 Labor-HEW appropriations bill (HR 8069) which provides $409,000 for the National Commission for FY 1976, the same amount the Commission received for FY 1975 but a reduction of $93,000 from the budget request. The House Appropriations Committee said it "denied the request for four new positions because it is not convinced that it is desirable to increase the existing staff of the Commission." The Appropriations Committee recommendation was a blow to the Commission which is counting upon its full budget request in order to hire additional staff to conduct in-house research in preparation for the implementation phase of its national program. The Senate Appropriations Committee is not expected to mark up its version of the Labor-HEW bill until after the July 4 recess.

* * * * *

Attachments: Funds for Library-Related Programs (table dated June 1975)
Status of Legislation Chart dated June 25, 1975

American Library Association
Washington Office
June 25, 1975

FY 1976 FUNDS FOR LIBRARY-RELATED PROGRAMS
(and Forward Funding for FY '77 where applicable)

	FY 1975 Appropriation	FY 1976 Budget[1]	FY 1976 House[2] Action	FY 1976 Senate[3] Action
Elementary and Secondary Education Act				
Title I - Educationally Deprived Children	$1,876,000,000	$1,900,000,000[1]	$2,050,000,000[4]	$2,050,000,000
II - School Library Resources	95,250,000	- 0 -[1]	- 0 -[4]	- 0 -
III - Suppl. Education Centers & Guid.	120,000,000	- 0 -[1]	- 0 -[4]	- 0 -
IV-B - Libraries & Learning Resources	- 0 -	137,330,000[1]	147,333,000[4]	147,330,000
IV-C - Education Innovation and Support	- 0 -	172,888,000[1]	172,888,000[4]	172,888,000
V - State Education Departments	39,425,000	- 0 -[1]	- 0 -[4]	- 0 -
VII - Bilingual Education Act	85,000,000	70,000,000	95,270,000	100,270,000
IX - Ethnic Heritage	1,800,000	- 0 -	1,800,000	1,800,000
Educ. Handicapped Children (state grants)	100,000,000	50,000,000[1]	110,000,000[4]	110,000,000
Metric education	- 0 -	2,090,000	2,090,000	2,090,000
Gifted & talented	- 0 -	2,560,000	2,560,000	2,560,000
Women's educational equity	- 0 -	6,270,000	6,270,000	6,270,000
Career education	10,000,000	10,135,000	10,135,000	10,135,000
Library Services and Construction Act	51,749,000	10,000,000	51,749,000	51,749,000
Title I - Library Services	49,155,000	10,000,000	49,155,000	49,155,000
II - Public Library Construction	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
III - Interlibrary Cooperation	2,594,000	- 0 -	2,594,000	2,594,000
IV - Older Readers Services	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Library Partnership Act (proposed)	- 0 -	20,000,000	- 0 -	- 0 -
National Defense Education Act				
Title III-A - Equip. & Minor Remodeling	21,750,000	14,125,000	- 0 -[4]	- 0 -
VI - - Language Development	11,300,000	8,640,000	11,300,000	15,300,000
Higher Education Act				
Title I - - Community Service Program	14,250,000	- 0 -	10,000,000	14,250,000
II-A - - College Library Resources	9,975,000	- 0 -	9,975,000	9,975,000
II-B - - Library Training	2,000,000	- 0 -	- 0 -	2,000,000
- Research and Demonstrations	1,000,000	- 0 -	- 0 -	1,000,000
Titles II-A & B total	12,975,000	- 0 -	9,975,000	12,975,000
II-C - - LC Acquisitions & Cataloging	9,365,000	9,748,000	9,653,391[5]	Pending
III - - Developing Institutions	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000
V-E - - EPDA Fellowships (Higher Educ.)	2,100,000	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
VI-A - - Undergrad. Equipment & Matls.	7,500,000	- 0 -	- 0 -	15,000,000
National Institute of Education	70,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	70,000,000
Postsecondary Educ. Innovation Fund	11,500,000	17,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
State Postsecondary Educ. Commissions	3,000,000	- 0 -	3,000,000	5,000,000
Adult Education Act (state grants)	67,500,000	67,500,000	71,500,000[4]	71,500,000
National Reading Improvement	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	22,000,000
Older Americans Act				
Title III - - Community Programs	105,000,000	96,000,000	deferred[6]	
IV - - Training and Research	15,000,000	7,000,000	"[6]	
IX - - Community Service Employment	12,000,000	- 0 -	30,000,000[7]	30,000,000[7]
Educational Broadcasting Facilities	12,000,000	7,000,000	10,000,000	15,000,000
National Library of Medicine	22,515,000	22,482,000	22,482,000[8]	pending
Medical Library Assistance Act	6,333,000	6,333,000	6,333,000[8]	pending
Natl. Commission on Libraries and Information Sc.	409,000	502,000	409,000[8]	pending
National Center for Educ. Statistics	9,060,000	16,665,000	14,000,000	13,000,000
GPO Superintendent of Documents	36,765,000	36,976,000	36,765,700[5]	pending
Indian Education Act	42,000,000	42,055,000	pending[9]	pending
Library of Congress	98,990,000	120,032,100	115,134,800[5]	pending
Arts and Humanities	159,000,000	175,000,000	pending[9]	pending
White House Conference on Library and Information Services	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	3,500,000

1/ FY 1977 budget is shown instead, for forwarded funded programs such as ESEA IV.
2/ Unless otherwise noted, HR 5901 House-passed FY 1976 educ. approps. bill.
3/ Unless otherwise noted, HR 5901 as reported from Sen. Approps. Committee.
4/ FY 1977 approps. are included in HR 5901 for forwarded funded programs. FY 1976 funds were provided for these programs in FY 1975 supplemental (PL 93-554).
5/ HR 6950, FY 1976 legis. branch appropriations as passed by House.
6/ Appropriation deferred pending enactment of authorization.
7/ FY 1976 appropriation provided by continuing resolution.
8/ FY 1976 Labor-HEW approps. (HR 8069) as reported from House Approps. Committee.
9/ To be included in approps. for Interior & related agencies not yet introduced.

American Library Association
Washington Office
June 1975

STATUS OF LEGISLATION OF INTEREST TO LIBRARIANS

94th Congress, 1st Session
Convened January 14, 1975

Chart Date: June 25, 1975

	HOUSE					SENATE					FINAL ACTION		
	Introduced	Hearings	Reported by Subcommittee	Committee Report Number	Floor Action	Introduced	Hearings	Reported by Subcommittee	Committee Report Number	Floor Action	Conference Report	Final Passage	Public Law
Appalachian Regional Dev. exten.	HR 4073	x	x	202	x	HR 4073							
Arts and Humanities extension	HR 7216					S 1800	x						
Child and Family Services	HR 2966	x				S 626	x						
Congressional Budget Targets FY'76	HCon Res 218	x		145	x	S Con Res 32	x		77	x	198	x	na
Copyright Revision	HR 2223	x				S 22		x					
Criminal Code Revision	HR 3907					S 1	x						
Education of Handicapped exten.	HR 7217	x	x			S 6	x	x	168	x			
Folklife Center in LC	HR 6673	x	x	273		S 1618							
Handicapped (Bill of Rights)	HR 4005	x	x	58	x	S 462	x	x	160	x			
Higher Educ. Amendments of '75	HR 3470												
Higher Educ. Student Financial Aid	HR 3471	x					x						
Intergovernmental Assistance	HR 6416					S 1359	x	x					
Japan-US Friendship Act	HR 4556					S 824			188	x			
National Institute of Education	HR 5988					S 1498							
National Science Foundation	HR 4723	x	x	66	x	S 1539	x	x	111	x			
Older Americans Amdts.	HR 3922	x	x	67	x	S 1425	x	x	255				
Postal Public Service Subsidy	HR 2445	x											
Public Broadcasting	HR 6461	x	x	245		S 893			55				
Public Service Employment (CETA VI)	HR 2584	x	x			S 1695							
Public Works	HR 5247	x	x	203	x	S 1587	x	x					
Revenue Sharing extension	HR 6558					S 1625							
Tax - manuscript donations	HR 6057					S 1435							
Telecommunications facil. & Demon.	HR 4564	x				S 1257							
Transition Quarter Authorization	HR 6692	x	x	282	x	S 1874							
Unemployment Assistance extension	HR 6900	x	x	220	x	HR 6900	x	x	200&208	x			
Women's Equal Educ. Opportunity						S 1338							
APPROPRIATIONS													
Emergency Employment, Fy 1975	HR 4481	x	x	52	x	HR 4481	x	x	91	x	201	x	VETO
Second Supplemental, FY1975	HR 5899	x	x	141	x	HR 5899	x	x	137	x	239	x	94-32
Continuing Resolution, FY 1976	HJ Res 499			289	x	HJ Res 499			201	x	none	x	94-
Education, FY 1976	HR 5901	x	x	142	x	HR 5901	x	x	198				
HUD & Independent Agencies, FY 1976	HR 8070	x	x	313	x	HR 8070	x						
Labor-HEW, FY 1976	HR 8069	x	x	311	x	HR 8069	x						
Legislative Branch, FY 1976	HR 6950	x	x	208	x	HR 6950	x	x					

NOTE: For copies of bills and reports, write to Hse. & Sen. Doc. Rms., U.S. Capitol, Wash., D.C. 20515 & 20510 respectively.